



Planning Inspectorate

National Infrastructure
Planning
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Bristol, BS1 6PN

Customer
Services: 0303 444 5000
e-mail: emgateway2@planninginspectorate.gov.uk

To the applicant
(By email only)

Your Ref:

Case ref: BC0410001

Date: 12 November 2025

Dear Toni Weston

Planning Act 2008 – section 51

Application by SEGRO Properties Limited for an order granting development consent for East Midlands Gateway phase 2

Advice following issue of decision to accept the application for examination

On 12 November 2025 the Secretary of State decided that the application for the above project satisfied the acceptance tests under section 55 of the Planning Act 2008 (PA2008). The Planning Inspectorate's acceptance checklist and the application documents have been published and made available on the project page of our website.

In undertaking checks at the acceptance stage, the Inspectorate has made some initial observations in relation to the application. This letter comprises advice to the applicant provided under section 51 of the PA2008 in respect of these initial observations. The applicant should pay attention to its content and consider how appropriate action might be taken in response.

Minor errors and omissions

There are minor errors and omissions, as reflected in Box 30 of the acceptance checklist and it is specifically suggested to the applicant that it considers these as well as the other comments in this advice.

All documents

There are a number of typographical and grammatical errors, inconsistent naming conventions across documents, missing hyperlinks, and other evident mistakes that have been identified by the Planning Inspectorate.

The Planning Inspectorate has, in particular, identified the Construction Environmental Management Plan and Construction Traffic Management Plan (Doc 6.3A), where multiple inconsistencies, typographical and grammatical errors have been identified.

Furthermore, the Planning Statement (Doc 5.4) uses the same acronym, "NPSNN" for both the National Policy Statement for National Networks and Neighbourhood Plans. Also, at paragraphs 4.3 and 4.19, the acronym NPSNNNN and NPSNN have both been used to describe the National Policy Statement for National Networks, in addition to NPSNN being used to describe National Policy Statement and National Policy Statement for National Networks. These should be amended and the relevant text in the document changed for clarity. Paragraph 5.2.55, second line would appear to have a typographic error in it, with the use of "if" when it possibly should be "is".

The Market Analysis/Need Report has Document DCO 5.5 titled 'Industrial and Logistics Need Assessment' which differs from the document title in the applicant's s55 checklist. Doc 1.3 and 1.7 both have Doc 5.5 titled 'Industrial and Logistics Need Assessment'

While some of these were noted during the acceptance checks and given here, it should be emphasised that the Planning Inspectorate does not undertake a quality assurance role. Accordingly, the applicant is advised to carry out a thorough review of all submitted documentation and make any necessary amendments.

The applicant is also recommended to consider the advice given in relation to the application for the Material Change Order (MCO) where it may reasonably apply to the DCO order.

Environmental Statement, all Chapters

For ease of reference, signposts should be provided to the specific sections or paragraphs in documents, chapters and/ or sections where documents outside of the ES are being referred to, particularly where these are documents comprised of multiple files or sheets.

Each aspect chapter includes details of the methodology applied and identifies the magnitude of impact and sensitivity of the receptors in each case and how these combine to provide a judgement of whether effects are significant or not significant. However, there are some conclusions that are unclear as to whether they are significant or not significant, this should be checked and clarified.

Some appendices are given a DCO and MCO reference number but the content within only appears to be relevant to the DCO application. This should be clarified in the numbering system.

Please also provide hyperlinks to allow navigation from the contents page to the relevant section of each ES chapter.

Environmental Statement, Chapter 3, Project Description (DCO 6.3)

Table 3.5 sets out the parameters and is helpful. It would also be helpful to indicate, perhaps in an additional column, where the detailed design for each component of the EMG2 works, and highway works, is secured in the dDCO.

The Limits of Deviation in the ES for the depth of the works to the electricity substation are stated as 2.5m, whereas it is 1.5m in the dDCO. These levels should be made consistent.

Environmental Statement, Landscape and Visual, Appendix 6.10 (DCO 6.10B)

This appendix contains viewpoints and photomontages for both the MCO and DCO applications. For ease of reference these should be separated into separate appendices.

Figure 8.1 demonstrates those viewpoints where photomontages are provided. Photoviewpoints D, E, F and G do not appear to have photomontages but it is also not easy to follow whether these correspond to the viewpoints described in the text when referring to Figure 8.1. Photoviewpoint A also appears to be a different background image in the existing view to that provided for the photomontages at years 0 and 15 for the same viewpoint. Clearer referencing of viewpoints and photomontages should be provided and ensure that appropriate photomontages are provided for all receptors where significant effects are predicted to occur in years 0 and 15.

Environmental Statement, Chapter 12, Cultural Heritage (DCO 6.12)

Paragraph 12.5.26: “Bult Heritage Assessment” – might be referring to the “Built Heritage Assessment”. Further, the paragraph starts by referring to “Long Whatton Conservation Area”, but later in the same paragraph switches to “Whatton Conservation Area”. Please amend accordingly for consistency of terms.

Paragraph 12.8.14 refers to the “proposed Isley of Woodhouse project”. Please check naming convention here and elsewhere, amending accordingly to ensure consistency of terms.

Chapter 12 refers to “Hyam’s Lane” (with apostrophe). Please check naming convention here and elsewhere, amending accordingly to ensure consistency of terms.

Review table 12.1 (including iterations in other chapters) to ensure that the works listed are representative of what is included in the dDCO and dMCO. For example, works to Long Holden are included in schedule 1 of the dDCO but are absent from the table.

Environmental Statement, Appendix A, Built Heritage Statement (DCO 6.12A)

A figure would be helpful to show the location and direction of photographs taken and shown as plates 1 to 11.

Environmental Statement, Appendix B, Archaeological Desk Based Assessment (DCO 6.12B)

Paragraph 6.11 states "...secured by means of an appropriately worded planning condition attached to consent." Please amend so that reference is made to the relevant requirement in the dDCO.

Environmental Statement, Appendix G, Flood Risk Assessment (DCO 6.13G)

Section 6 includes a concluding statement that attempts to draw everything together. However, the lack of detail limits the summary's usefulness. It would be helpful to summarise the flood risks that were assessed, the mitigation measures that would limit flood risk and compliance with any relevant policy tests, such as the sequential test and exception test. Where the exception test is not relevant, a summary of how general flood risk policy tests have been met, such as those in the NNNPS at paragraph 5.133.

Figure 4.27 shows the location of the substation. No parameters are provided for the works on this plan. A reference to a parameters plan should be provided and where relevant, the assessment updated to confirm these parameters have been considered in the assessment. As noted in comments relating to ES Chapter 3, the Environmental Statement project description [Doc Ref: DCO 6.3] also has different parameters for the substation to those provided in the draft Development Consent Order (dDCO) [Doc Ref: 3.1]. All these documents should be consistent in the parameters used and assessed.

Details of the Operation and Maintenance management are secured within the dDCO requirement 16 and 17 but please clarify the process for management of surface water drainage.

Environmental Statement, Chapter 16, Utilities (DCO 6.16)

Paragraph 16.7.1 refers to 'sections 10.5 and 10.6 of this chapter'. Please confirm whether this should refer to sections 16.5 and 16.6 and amend accordingly.

Paragraph 16.9.10 refers to "the Utilities Strategy (which includes all the embedded mitigation)". Please identify the document(s) this term is intended to describe, including document reference numbers, and explain how implementation of that "Utilities Strategy" is secured through the dDCO (e.g. Schedule 16 certification, requirements, or protective provisions). If it is not a separate document, please clarify the wording.

Paragraph 16.8.3 includes a double conjunction: "whilst ... however" in the same sentence. Further grammatical errors, including "proposal are", which should be "proposal is". Review and amend accordingly.

It would be helpful if the applicant could clarify, for the avoidance of doubt, that they have not identified likely significant effects on utilities as a result of cumulative effects with other developments that do not yet have planning permission.

Paragraph 16.2.8 reads “sever damage” and appears it should instead read “severe damage” please amend accordingly.

Environmental Statement, Appendix A, Utilities Assessment Report (DCO 6.16A)

Disclaimers are present in this document. Ensure that this issue is addressed, either by removing the disclaimers or ensuring that the documents can be relied upon for the purposes of the examination. Ensure each document submitted with the application is checked accordingly.

Environmental Statement, Chapter 17, Population and Human Health (DCO 6.17)

Under table 17.4, hospital admissions for coronary heart disease appear to be listed twice. Please confirm whether this is intentional (e.g. referring to different indicators) or correct the table to remove duplication.

Under table 17.11, the list of non-motorised user road links includes a duplicate reference to link 43 ('links 28, 42, 43, 44, 45, 50 and 43'). Please confirm whether this should refer to link 53 (as in table 17.10) and update the chapter accordingly. Cross check elsewhere in the environmental statement for similar errors, particularly chapter 6 and paragraphs 6.6.26 to 6.6.37.

The reference to 'Maon Street' in Lockington appears to be a typographical error. Please confirm and correct if this should read 'Main Street'. Cross check elsewhere in the environmental statement for similar errors and amend accordingly.

Table 17.11 refers to mitigation being 'considered in Section 17.6.617'. Please confirm the correct paragraph or section reference and update the table accordingly.

Environmental Statement, Chapter 18, Minerals and Waste (DCO 6.18)

Paragraph 18.5.11 (waste in relation to the DCO application) includes reference to the MCO application as well.

Table 18.21 has no table heading

Chapter 18 appendices would benefit from clearer titles to refer to the assessment it supports. The labels on appendix 18D could also be added to for context on the map.

Illustrative Landscape Masterplan EMG2 Works (DCO 2.6)

Check that the document name is representative of the title block and that, whichever naming convention is correct, has been used consistently across application documents. For example, the document name is “Illustrative Landscape Masterplan – EMG2 Works” but it is referred to as “Illustrative Landscape Masterplan” in the title block, and the Guide to the Application (Doc 1.3). Conversely the figure 5.1 of the Design Approach Document refers to Illustrative Masterplan Image of EMG2 Works.

Please pay close attention to the advice set out in this letter and act on it accordingly. It is requested that you action these points, in addition to s51 advice given on 30 September 2025, before the commencement of the relevant representation period. This will contribute towards a more efficient examination and give any future Examining Authority comfort that the documentation is complete and accurate.

We trust you find this advice helpful, however if you have any queries on these matters please do not hesitate to contact our office using the contact details at the head of this letter.

Yours sincerely

Matthew Sheard
Case Manager

This communication does not constitute legal advice.
Please view our [Privacy Notice](#) before sending information to the Planning Inspectorate.